Dewan.—

That is not a supplemental question and cannot be answered now.

Mr. B. Srinivasiengar of Anekal.—

With reference to item No. 75 in Appendix V (of replies to Interpellations), will the Government be pleased to state whether any new cutcherry was constructed at all ?

Dewan.—

It ought to be repairs and additions to the old cutcherry. It is now reported that the amount represents the cost of constructing a new taluk cutcherry the estimate for which was sanctioned but has not been operated upon.

A Member.—

The Nidasala tank :—The figure, Rs. 6,668, shown against Nidasala tank is not correct, as any body who has seen the work done on the tank will admit that work costing much more than the sum has been done.

Dewan.—

There seems to be a mistake here and the matter will be enquired nto.

It is now seen that it is a mistake in printing and the figure should be Rs. 66,606.

By Messrs. M. C. Lingegowda and S. C. Mallíah,— (Mandya Rural).

Q.—21. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) What is the amount of bid by Mr. Ranga Rao, Excise Contractor, in the Excise sale of Hunsur and Gundlupet Taluks for 1923-24 ?

(*b*) Whether he furnished any amount as deposit in accordance with the rules when he was declared the highest bidder ?

(*c*) What was the amount lost by Government on account of resale ?

(*d*) Whether it will not be in accordance with the rules to recover the amount so lost, from the officer responsible for this neglect ?

Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.—

			Rs.
A.—21. (*a*) 1. Hunsur Taluk	Monthly rental		3,171
2. Gundlupet Taluk	Do	....	2,732

(*b*) Yes. One month's rental was paid as initial deposit by means of cheques. Credit was given for the value of the cheques but on their being dishonoured later by the Bank the credit afforded in the accounts was cancelled.

(*c*) The loss was Rs. 1,025 per mensem consisting of Rs. 546 in Hunsur Taluk and Rs. 479 in Gundlupet Taluk.

(*d*) There is no rule requiring such losses to be recovered from officers responsible for neglect. Further in this case, there was no neglect on the part of any officer for which he may be held responsible.

Supplementary Questions.

Mr. B. L. Byanna.—

With reference to answer to question No. 21 (*b*), will the Government be pleased to state why action was not taken to recover the dues from Mr. Ranga Rao soon after the cheque was dishonoured by the Bank?

Dewan.—

That is not a supplemental question.

Mr. B. L. Byanna.—

With reference to answer to question No. 21 (*d*) will the Government be pleased to state what steps Government propose to take in order to recover the loss sustained by them?

Second Member.—

Government propose to proceed against the properties of Mr. Ranga Rao.

Mr. Lingegowda.—

I want to know whether only cash should be received as deposit or whether cheques may be accepted.

Second Member.—

There is nothing to prevent cheques from being accepted.

By Messrs. B. Siddalingasetty and B. Channappa,— (Yedatore Rural).

Q.—22. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) Whether the potgi given to patels and shanbhogs of villages by the side of new channels is in proportion to the amount of assessment collected by them? If not, why not?